

## HOMONYMS COMPARISONAL ANALYSIS IN THE ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

**Bobonazarova Muxlisa Yomg'ir qizi**

( English teacher of the Shahrizabz State Pedagogical Institute)

### ABSTRACT

This article discusses about the interlanguage homonyms in media texts and Cultural aspects of homonyms. It includes, as a demand ABSTRACT, keywords, introduction, main part, conclusion and reference.

**Keywords:** homonyms, media texts, cultural aspects, interlanguage, paradigm, semantics.

Near investigation of homonyms in Russian and English is important to explain the contrasts (quantitative and subjective) that exist between the two dialects in this sense. It is evident that the aftereffects of such an examination are vital for the advancement of strategies for showing English homonyms of Russophones.

We can say that the near typology of dialects all in all has an applied significance for linguo-didactics and is sought after in those cases at the point when defeating speech is vital impedance, as well as in the arrangement of the phonetic skill of understudies. Note that homonymy overall is one of the elements of interlingual and intralingual obstruction.

Interlanguage obstruction on account of homonyms is appeared in the incident of sound and/or spelling of words in various dialects (the supposed "bogus companions of the interpreter"). Intralingual obstruction concerns the issue of separating polysemy and homonymy.

A significant contribution to the study of the phenomenon of interference was made by domestic researchers U.K. Yusupov, M. Dzhusupov, J. J. Jalolov. In particular, he writes: "The reasons for interlingual interference, in our opinion, are in the difference between the languages in contact (between language systems and between operations performed at different levels of speech generation and comprehension), in the degree of strength of speech skills, or in the absence of skills in foreign language. The first reason is linguistic, and the second is psychological"[6]. It is interesting to note that W.C. Yusupov has an interesting idea that one of the forms of interference manifestation is silence: "It has been established that interlingual interferences are manifested in speech not only in the form of a deviation from the norm of one or each of the contacting languages (in the linguistic sense) or in the form

of negative transfer of speech skills (in the psychological sense), but can also manifest itself in the form of silence (in the linguistic sense) or an unsuccessful attempt to transfer the skills of the native language (in the psychological sense), i.e. in the form of zero carry ”[6]. M. Dzhusupov made an exhaustive review of the existing linguistic interpretations of such a phenomenon as speech interference:

Speech interference:

- interference - negative carryover
- negative result of the interaction of languages, which manifests itself in the form of violations of the norms of the studied language in the process of using it by a bilingual (U. Weinreich)
- a set of negative and positive transfers, since both types of transfer are the result of interaction and mutual influence of contacting languages. Proponents of this point of view do not oppose negative transference (interference) to positive transference (facilitation), considering that both types of transference are the result of the same phenomenon – interference
- transferring the peculiarities of the native language to the foreign language being studied ”, i.e. as a one-way process when contacting language systems
- interference is understood not as a mechanism for the interaction of languages, but as a result of this interaction

Note also that M. Dzhusupov himself significantly expands the content of the concept of speech interference: “Speech interference, as a rule, is viewed as a one-way process, that is, as a negative influence of the features of the native language on the process of mastering a non-native language. We consider speech interference in a nonnative language as a two way process: errors in speech in the target language are the result of the negative influence of the characteristics of both the native language and the target language” [1]. In the works of J.J. Jalolov develops the idea that, in addition to linguistic interference, the concepts of culturological and methodological interference are relevant for linguo-didactics: “The fact is that a language, including a non-native language, is assimilated simultaneously as a reflection of the culture of a country or a native speaker. Therefore, for two decades, the latter have been intensively learning the language along with the culture, for example, teaching the English language and culture. In our opinion, this is how the subject should be called. All this suggests that when mastering the culture of a native speaker, the so called cultural interference is also manifested, the overcoming of which is of linguodidactic importance” [2]. Obviously, when teaching homonyms of the English language, the teacher and students have to deal with the manifestation of interference of all the listed types.

In this regard, the phenomenon of English-Russian interlanguage homonymy requires special consideration, i.e. the so-called "false friends of the translator". This figurative expression is traditionally used to denote lexemes in tune with each other, but inconsistent in meaning in two different languages. For example, the English word artist - a person who creates paintings or drawings as a profession or hobby, is consonant with the Russian word артист; book - a written or printed work consisting of pages glued or sewn together along one side and bound in covers, consonant with the Russian word - бук (type of tree); boy - a male child or youth. - cf. Russian бой; box - a container with a flat base and sides, typically square or rectangular and having a lid - English in Russian бокс (kind of sport); bread - food made of flour, water, and yeast mixed together and baked - cf. Russian бред (nonsense); capital - the city or town that functions as the seat of government and administrative centre of a country or region - cf. Russian капитал; clever - smart - cf. Russian клевер (plant); look - direct one's gaze toward someone or something or in a specified direction - cf. Russian лук (vegetable) and many others.

The phenomenon of lexical homonymy has the character of a linguistic universal and therefore the ontological properties of lexical homonyms in English and Russian are generally comparable: their sources, types and stylistic functions in speech are similar. However, along with this, the English homonyms, in comparison with the Russians, have some specific features. The differences between homographs and homophones are particularly clear.

So, despite the fact that there are significantly more homonyms in English than in Russian, their collision in the text occurs relatively rarely. This is due to the fact that in the process of speech implementation, homonymy, fixed at the level of the language system, is removed as a result of shaping. For example, most English verbs that are homonymous to each other in the infinitive form do not coincide in other forms. In the form of an infinitive, they are used only in certain cases, for example, if they stand in Present Indefinite Tense or Future Indefinite Tense, coinciding in sound and writing with the forms of the 1st and 2nd person singular and plural and 3rd person plural.

In general, the nature of the differences between Russian and English homonyms is rooted mainly in morphology and word formation. If English is an analytical language then Russian functions as a language of a synthetic structure with a tendency towards analyticism. This means that the synthetic grammatical method dominates in the Russian language and inflection is actively used. In English, inflection has lost its meaning and function. This led to a sharp increase in the possibilities for the emergence of homonyms as a result of syntactic transposition, that is, the transition of words from one part of speech to another. For example, bill (the jaws of a bird together with their horny covering) - bill (to touch and rub bill to bill), bowl (a bowl-shaped structure) -

bowl (to roll a ball), break (interrupt a sequence, course, or continuous state) - break (to separate into parts with suddenness or violence), brush (a device composed of bristles typically set into a handle and used especially for sweeping, smoothing, scrubbing, or painting) - brush (remove (dust or dirt) by sweeping or scrubbing). It is quite obvious that in the Russian language there are much fewer such examples - cf. homonymy of the word один (one - numerical) - один (one - adj.) - один (one - pronoun).

The ratio of the parts of speech involved in the act of transposition is also different in Russian and English. For example, in Russian language, the transition of a verb into a noun or a noun into a verb, similar to the above examples, is impossible. In such cases, in Russian language, either the suffix or the nonaffix method finds its application, compare: to move (двигать) - movement (движение), to run (бегать) - run (бег). The presence of endings in the Russian language leads to the emergence of expanded inflectional paradigms, within which homoforms arise. Despite the fact that there are cases of homoforms in the English language, their number is significantly less and does not have the character of morphological opposition in view of its unsystematic nature. Some exceptions to this are homoforms of Present Continuous Tense verbs, for example, reading (n) - reading (v.), meeting (n.) - meeting (v.).

I enjoy reading (Я люблю читать);

I am reading a book (Я читаю книгу).

In English, the nature of homographs and homophones is different. This is due to differences in the guiding principles of spelling. If in the Russian language the leading is the morphological principle of spelling (the principle of uniform spelling of morphemes), then in the English language the overwhelming majority of spellings are subject to the historical and traditional principle. It follows from this that both languages are to some extent distanced from the phonetic principle, which requires, as you know, the coincidence of sound and spelling. In other words, the sound and spelling of words and morphemes in Russian and English do not coincide approximately to the same extent, but the nature of these discrepancies is different. Thus, if homographs and homophones in Russian arise under the influence of living phonetic processes, then in English they are the result of historical processes. This is directly reflected in the teaching strategy of Russian and English homographs and homophones. If in teaching Russian homographs and homophones the emphasis should be on the study of the synchronic aspect of phonetics, then in teaching English - on the study of the diachronic aspect of phonetics. Taking into account the complexity of this approach, it turns out to be most expedient to refer to the dictionary and simply memorize the existing differences.

### REFERENCES:

- 1) Dzhusupov, M. (2017), Bulletin of RUDN University // Series: Educational issues: languages and specialty. - T., - 14, - No. 3.
- 2) Jalolov, J.J. (2017), Interference in the methodology of teaching a non-native language // Uzbekistonda xorijiy tillar // ilmiy-methodik electronic journal, No. 5.
- 3) Mamedova, M.A. (2020), Homonymy as one of the difficulties of the English language // Pedagogical skills, - No. 5, ISSN 2181-6883.
- 4) Mamedova, M.A. (2020), The role of computer technologies in teaching English to students of secondary schools // Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University. - No. 10. ISSN 2181-0427
- 5) Mamedova, M.A. (2020), Methodical features of teaching homonyms of English language using computer technology // International Journal of psychosocial Rehabilitation, ISSN: 1475- 7192